

BEST AVAILABLE COPYREMARKS

Applicant has amended Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to Claim 1 are supported by the Application as originally filed and does not contain any new matter. Therefore, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended.

Firstly, Applicant would like to acknowledge the Examiner's statement that the priority documents have been received and accepted.

Next, the Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), stating that the drawings do not show each and every element of the claims, particularly that "at least one diffusing lens element allowing said parallel light fluxes...to be emitted diffusely must be shown." Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to Fig. 4 and respectfully submits that the parallel light fluxes which impinge on the diffusers 14E are focused to a focal point; however, the focal point is somewhat near the light and once the light passes through the focal point, it then will diffuse. As a result, when one looks at the lens of the lamp from a long distance, the light will be diffused and the parallel light passing through the convex lens elements will look the same as if it had passed through a concave lens element. This action is also shown relative to portion 14D where you can see the light passing through the focal point and then diffusing outwardly. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings do show a diffusing element. Therefore, the Examiner's objection to the drawings is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, stating that the diffusing lens element is not clear.

In reply thereto, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to Applicant's explanation given above, and respectfully submits that the lens elements 14E do diffuse the light.

Next, the Examiner rejects the Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Yanez, stating that Yanez discloses each and every element of Applicant's invention.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to point out that Applicant's invention is different therefrom and at least the parallel translation controlling portion and each particular shape as now defined by the Claim 1 (currently amended) is not shown or suggested therein. Therefore,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicant respectfully submits that Yanez does not show each and every element of Applicant's invention and the Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 11 are not anticipated thereby.

The Examiner has rejected the Claims 5, 8, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Yanez, stating that Yanez discloses each and every element of the claimed invention except a set of LED light sources and said translucent member provided at a plurality of locations; but it is further the Examiner's opinion that Yanez does teach the application of the obstacle lighting device of LED light sources and translucent members to at least vehicle running lights and turn indicators.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Yanez, and again point out that at least Yanez does not show the parallel translation control portion and its particular construction and shape as is now claimed by Applicant's Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 5, 8, 10, and 12 are not obvious over Yanez.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, favorably considered, and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 
William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1140
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission